DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 178 HE 001 406

AUTHOR	Wise, W. Max
TITLE	The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government.
INSTITUTION	Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Conn.
PUB DATE	[68]
NOTE	67p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Hazen Foundation, 400 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn. 06511
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.45
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy, Faculty, *Financial Support, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, *Planning, *Private Colleges, School Community Relationship, Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The private liberal arts colleges are in trouble. Most of their presidents, boards of trustees and the literature tends to blame their problems on external developments. Evidence indicates, however, that much of the blame falls on the colleges themselves. Many private colleges have failed to adapt to new pressures in US higher education and have been unable to develop new conceptions of purposes which elicit the support of faculty, students and the public. This report discusses in detail the process of clarifying these purposes and of securing support from interested parties; and it offers suggestions for the alleviation of the malaise which characterizes many of these colleges. The report is based on intensive study of 6 private liberal arts colleges, at which interviews were conducted with presidents, and selected members of the faculty and student body. In addition, the colleges made available for examination the minutes of meetings of the boards of trustees and faculty and student committees. (AF)

ED037178

THE POLITICS OF THE PRIVATE COLLEGE:

An Inquiry Into the Processes of Collegiate Government

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 406

by

W. Max Wise

Additional Copies are available on request to The HAZen Foundation, 400 Prospect Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Contents

FOREWORD 5

AUTHOR'S PREFACE 7

INTRODUCTION 9

THE PRIVATE COLLEGE UNDER CHALLENGE 13

POLITICS IN THE COLLEGE 18

THE NEW POLITICS OF THE COLLEGE 21

. . . AND SOME OF THE OLD 28

THE PRESIDENT 35

THE SOURCES OF PRESIDENTIAL INFLUENCE 42

THE FACULTY 46

THE STUDENTS 51

BOARDS OF TRUSTEES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST .. 57

THE QUESTIONABLE FUTURE 62

NOTES 68

Foreword

A study of the college as a social organization was undertaken because of a desire to learn more about the ways in which colleges and universities carry on their work and about the reasons why they show such highly individual attitudes toward their common purposes. Commenting upon the paucity of studies of the structure and functioning of colleges, Nevitt Sanford in *The American College* had written, "Our greatest lack, in this social sphere, is of knowledge of the inner workings of colleges. . . . We are raising here the question of institutional dynamics, the question of which subsystems can influence events in others, and which are open to influence from outside the total system." Professor W. Max Wise was persuaded to direct such a study which he undertook to carry on along with other duties as a vice-president of the Danforth Foundation and as a professor in Columbia University's Teachers College. He brought to the endeavor wide experience as university teacher and administrator both here and abroad, as a psychologist and as an author, as well as a deep concern for a deeper understanding of the inner workings of colleges.

"The Politics of the Private College: An Inquiry into the Processes of Collegiate Government" has grown out of that study. It appears at a time of anxious concern and controversial discussion about the future of the liberal arts college and is published in the hope that it will add an element of realism to the debates and stimulate imaginative planning in some of the colleges.

In one sense it is not a report, certainly not a complete report on the study, nor is this the occasion to undertake to make one. It is, however, important for the reader to know that development of the study required devotion and exacting scholarship in designing, testing, and using a conceptual model of the operating bases of the contemporary college. From these efforts it became possible to gather data in descriptive form to which some reference is made in the text. In addition to the intensive study of the institutions directly involved, the author's thinking and writing reflects discussion with other scholars with whom he was associated in his teaching and foundation activities. "The Politics of the Private College" thus grows out of both scholarship and reflection upon a social problem of major importance and increasing urgency.

The admirable terse style of the essay makes for clarity and few

if any thoughtful readers will be misled by the occasional deliberate understatement.

The Hazen Foundation wishes to express its sincere appreciation to Max Wise for the devoted and imaginative way in which he developed the study and prepared the essay, and to thank all who assisted him.

Paul J. Braisted
The Hazen Foundation

Author's Preface

This report is the result of an opportunity afforded by support from The Hazen Foundation to visit and study six private, liberal arts colleges over a period of time. The study was intended to describe the individuality of these colleges. However, that focus was abandoned in light of the overwhelming evidence that the six colleges resembled each other far more than they differed one from another. In a sense, therefore, the present report is an accident: or, perhaps more accurately, it flows from a discovery that the original assumptions with which it began could not stand the weight of evidence collected in the colleges.

The study was undertaken in the knowledge that private colleges are now uncertain institutions in our society. However, the degree to which these colleges have a problematic future was not apparent at the outset of the study. Only when interviews and visits revealed the extent to which these campuses are divided communities, with factions in the faculties and student bodies exhibiting substantial alienation from presidential leadership, did the form of the report take shape. Fortunately, one of the colleges represented a variation from the generally discouraging pattern and provided important clues for the reforms which are proposed.

This report would not have been possible without the help of several persons. First, the presidents, faculty and students in the six colleges showed a generosity of spirit and time, as well as a remarkable willingness to reveal their views of their institutions, which made the study feasible. Second, Paul Braisted, President of The Hazen Foundation, has encouraged and supported the study from the beginning. Third, Olwen Jones, Richard M. Gummere, Jr. and Jerry Godard have at various stages helped with the field work and otherwise contributed to the ideas of this report.

W. Max Wise

Introduction

When American academics discuss the problems of the colleges and universities in which they work there is usually an interesting difference in the temper and substance of their comments, depending on the type of institutions which they represent. Those who represent universities, public and private, tend to discuss new possibilities for federal support of research and the latest developments in their fields of specialization. But those who represent private, liberal arts colleges* focus on questions of purpose and survival: "Have the traditional functions of the private, liberal arts college any relevance for a period dominated by specialized scholarship and research activities? How can the private college secure the funds necessary to carry on? Will the private college disappear and be replaced by tax-supported systems of public colleges and universities?

The reasons for the differences in outlook are, of course, rooted in changes in our society which have been at work for a century or more. During that period academic scholarship has become more specialized and more professionalized, the principle that states should support comprehensive systems of colleges and universities from tax funds has been accepted everywhere and—perhaps most important—the parochial (religious or social) interests which justified many of our private colleges have been swept aside in favor of cosmopolitan and secular perspectives.[1] Furthermore, the principal sources of financial support for the small, private college during the previous period—individuals with large fortunes and religious organizations—now provide an insignificant part of the funds needed by these colleges.[2]

Faced with these fundamental changes many private colleges appear to have been immobilized: they have failed to adapt to the new forces at work in U.S. higher education and have been unable to develop new conceptions of purposes which elicit the support of faculty, students and the public. The results for many colleges are that faculty and students are unclear about the basic purposes of their colleges, presidents are overwhelmed by conflicting demands from internal and

* I have used the term "private" to include independent and church-related colleges, for it seems to me they face similar problems if they focus on undergraduate, liberal arts education and if they are not part of a university—with its emphasis on graduate and professional education—and do not have tax appropriations to support basic operating costs.

external groups, and boards of trustees are confused about priorities.

A part of the remedy of these difficulties in the private colleges lies in concerted public action on their behalf. New funds must be provided, and most must come from tax sources.[3] New levels of understanding of the public services performed by these institutions must be achieved. But another and important part of the remedy must consist of action by the colleges themselves. Purposes must be adapted to the cosmopolitan and secular perspectives of American scholarship; old forms of internal organization must be abandoned in favor of those which promote initiative and free discussion; and the divided allegiances of faculty and students must be brought to bear on the work of the college.

To assume—as many private colleges do—that faculty, students and interested citizens (religious or social groups, foundations and governmental agencies) will continue to support the college because of traditional loyalties is a serious misreading of contemporary forces in the society. Unless the private college articulates its purposes clearly and unless it elicits a considerable degree of freely given commitment to these purposes, the present difficulties are likely to expand.

The process of clarifying purposes and of securing support from interested parties for them is essentially political,[4] because it involves careful analysis of the motives and interests of persons connected with the college and exercise of leadership in ways which express the purposes of the college and strengthen the commitment to them.

The report which follows discusses these processes in some detail and offers suggestions for the alleviation of the malaise which characterizes many of these colleges. It is based on intensive study of six private, liberal arts colleges. In each of these, interviews were conducted with presidents and with selected members of the faculty and the student body. In addition, the colleges made minutes of meetings of boards of trustees and of faculty and student committees available for examination.

Because of the possibility that the six colleges which were studied intensively may not have represented private, liberal arts colleges adequately, conversations were held with a variety of experienced observers of these institutions to check the applicability of the findings to the broader population. In the main, these conversations sustained the proposition that—except for a small number of colleges which occupy privileged positions (perhaps 50 or so)—the data collected in the six colleges, have direct implications for the private colleges of the United States.

It is instructive to note that a review of published literature about private colleges did not prove particularly helpful to the study. This is because the literature is mainly defensive in nature and not analytical: most of the writing suggests that the difficulties of the private colleges are the result of external developments, but does not suggest how colleges should move to deal with these influences. The literature is strangely silent on questions of internal organization, styles of leadership, etc.—perhaps because these colleges feel under such massive strain as to preclude self-examination.

There is an interesting parallel between the published literature on the private college and the written statements of presidents and boards of trustees of the institutions which were examined. Both are largely devoid of candor about the present state of these colleges. Apparently presidents and trustees assume that public statements should emphasize the "strengths" of their colleges while "weaknesses" should be treated as essentially private matters.[5]

Lack of candor on the part of most private colleges has two observable results:

1. The disparity between the statements of presidents and trustees and the firsthand knowledge of faculty and students about the condition of their colleges has made meaningful discussion difficult on campuses and thus blocked the development of internal support for the college.

2. The constituents of the college, and the public generally, being uninformed about the problems of the college—financial and educational—have little sense of the needs of the college and the dimensions of support necessary for its development.[6]

Private, liberal arts colleges are among the more durable of our social institutions. During their history, which now spans more than three centuries, they have adapted to several major changes in the society and to transformations of intellectual outlook and style: the industrialization of the 19th century, the inclusion of scientific studies in the curricula, etc. These colleges are required to make yet another adaptation if they are to continue to serve the needs of the United States today.

Of the problems which now require attention in these colleges none seems more important to alleviate than the prevailing sense of lack of purpose and vitality, accompanied by a feeling that they are di-

vided communities: administrators, faculty, students and interested patrons often work at cross purposes and leadership is ineffective.

The successful adaptation of the private college to contemporary forces requires careful analysis of the social environment within which they function and modification of traditional relations which define the ways in which faculty and students are associated with presidents and trustees. This report argues that these colleges have failed to assess their social environments and have perpetuated antiquated internal relationships beyond their usefulness. The report also offers suggestions for the restoration of a cohesive spirit on these campuses.

The Private College Under Challenge

The colleges which are the subject of this discussion* represent a sector of U.S. higher education which is under special strain. They are independent and church-related colleges which emphasize undergraduate liberal arts programs and are therefore subject to two major difficulties:

1. Lacking endowment funds, and not being tax-supported, they must raise financial resources primarily through tuition charges to students and through appeals to individuals, corporations, and foundations for grants. These colleges must, therefore, give considerable attention to the cultivation of new sources of funds, but they must also establish clear priorities with respect to the use of their limited resources, balancing a series of interests as they reach decisions with respect to the use of their funds.

In a sense, these colleges must perform a delicate juggling act, keeping their traditional sources of financial support intact—gifts from interested individuals and groups and continuing enrollment of new students from families with some connection with the college—while they develop new sources of income from individuals and groups with no personal connection with the college. At the same time, the alloca-

* Inasmuch as the purpose of the study is to discuss private colleges generally and because the six colleges were promised anonymity, no direct reference to individual institutions is included in the report. However, the opportunity to examine the operational procedures of the colleges: how they adapt to changing conditions, how they develop and allocate their resources, and how interested parties—presidents, boards, faculty, students and patrons—bring their influence to bear on the institutions, furnished invaluable aid in developing the study.

tion of resources within the college must be made with extreme care in order to husband those funds which are available.

2. As part of a system of higher education which is currently dominated by large and complex universities (with their emphasis on research and advanced study) and being primarily engaged in teaching the liberal arts—an enterprise fraught with dangers of intellectual contradictions and social irrelevance—these colleges are inclined to view recent developments with hostility and the future with uncertainty. Hence, they are blanketed with a spirit of discouragement, if not despair.[7]

The rise in operating costs, which shows no signs of abating, and the dominance of the American system of higher education by tax-supported institutions has placed a special strain on these institutions. Most wonder whether they can survive in a competitive system in which increasing proportions of students will be enrolled in tax-supported institutions. Furthermore, in an academic atmosphere dominated by specialization and fragmentation of knowledge, the old assumptions about liberal education have been cast in doubt and no clear rationale has yet arisen in their place.

In spite of the difficulties which they face, it is clear that these colleges (at least their presidents and trustees) expect to continue. Most are making considerable effort to discover a viable basis for the future. They believe that the independent liberal arts college has an important part to play in educating young Americans, although most are unable or unwilling to articulate these purposes in concise and distinctive language. In the main, their discussions of purposes are vague and are obviously intended to reassure those who wish these colleges to remain "true to traditional values" as well as those who wish these colleges to develop new and more appropriate purposes for the modern period.

While the statements of purposes of these colleges vary in tone and substance, there is a certain sameness which characterizes them: reference is uniformly made to "liberal education" and to the fact that the student may prepare for a career or for further study in graduate or professional school. Church-related colleges claim to offer guidance to students in their search for a religious faith while disclaiming any intention of indoctrinating students with the specific beliefs of the affiliated denomination.

What is lacking in almost all statements of purpose is any clear exposition of assumptions which distinguish one college from the

others (the exceptions are those colleges which claim that they have remained small to facilitate student-faculty relations and a few institutions which note that students are required to abide by specific elements of dogma associated with a religious view). The statements of purpose are uniformly unclear with respect to the student clientele served (perhaps because most of these colleges wish to serve more distinguished student bodies than now attend), the particular strengths of curricular offerings (perhaps because it is difficult internally to select a department or area for special mention), and the degree to which the college accepts an explicit theory of learning, i.e., the relative importance of traditional exposition by faculty versus the shifting of responsibility for learning to the student, etc. (perhaps because few colleges have agreed upon any approach to learning).

While the data in this study show that these colleges are mainly characterized by malaise and drift and procrastination, usually manifested by the practice of appointing committees to study "problems," there is also evidence of modest change: some curricula have been revised to incorporate modern notions of scholarship in the disciplines, adaptations in student life have been incorporated into the institutions, and most are undertaking programs to increase physical facilities.

The major changes, however, appear to be unplanned: new federal legislation makes matching funds available for instructional facilities, often representing needs of low priority; an unexpected gift with conditions makes a possible new program which may have little connection with the central purposes of the college; a tax-supported college is established nearby which threatens the drawing power of the college for students of the immediate geographic area; a crisis in relations with students or a department occurs and must be resolved.

Part of the reason for the appearance of drift and procrastination is due to the fact that the long-range plans of these colleges, usually covering the next decade or so, are flexible and obscure enough to allow for unexpected developments. That is, the plans fail to state precisely what the colleges expect to be doing in the future and hence provide almost no guide for current decisions. Many of the developments in these colleges during the past two decades have thus been taken in the absence of well-defined, coherent plans. Most decisions are therefore made on an *ad hoc* basis and are often contradictory to each other.

In a general sense the problems of these colleges are clear enough (it should be added that they are also formidable). The colleges must develop purposes appropriate both to their anticipated resources and

to the social needs of the nation for liberally educated citizens, and they must develop sufficient understanding and support from faculty, students, interested citizens and governments to carry out these purposes. These two undertakings—the clarification of purposes and the development of coherent support for them—are seriously lacking in the colleges which have been the subject of this study. Statements of purpose have been developed but often without support from interested* parties. In fact, interested parties often appear to be working at cross purposes, with the result that they frustrate any clear sense of direction in the college.

In the absence of a sense of direction in the college, and in the absence of a feeling that they can help develop substantial changes in the institution, most participants—in particular, faculty and students—give attention only to those matters which jeopardize their self-interest: the faculty act to prevent interference with their careers as academics and the students act to protect their personal freedom. Both groups are, of course, willing to give modest support to the institution because their interests are associated with its continuance and on occasion individual faculty and students serve on committees which address themselves to issues which affect the whole college. But such activities tend to be short lived and do not often temper the general political climate of the institution: they can be summed up in the view that the interests of faculty and students are distinct from those of the administration and the belief that they must protect these interests, largely through veto action and the frustration of presidential and board initiative.

Nonetheless, there is a reservoir of potential allegiance to the college among faculty and students. This can be developed if careful attention is given to the relationships between their interests and the purposes of the institution and if internal political processes are developed to give them a sense that their influence can affect change.

Interviews conducted with selected faculty and students at the six colleges which were studied suggest the considerable effect on gen-

* I shall be using the term "interest" to suggest that persons and groups related to the college have somewhat distinct goals and purposes which are represented in the attitudes they strike toward events which occur and issues which arise in the institution. I recognize the vagueness of the term and its complexity. It fails, for example, to distinguish between motives designed to protect advantages to self and those which aim at promoting service to society. But since it indicates that differences of opinion are not simply exercises in polemics but are related to more enduring and more fundamental motives, whatever their bases, it seems a useful concept.

eral outlook which results from direct participation in institutional planning and decision-making. Without design, the persons interviewed included both those with such experience and those without. While distinctions in degrees of allegiance to the colleges between these two groups cannot be attributed solely to the influence of "participants" having gained more perspective on the college and more feeling of having played a useful role in resolving difficult problems, such a thesis is supported by findings in social psychology of the likely effects of direct participation in problem-solving. Furthermore, several who were interviewed believe that, having "understood" their colleges for the first time and having influenced action by the college, their previous level of commitment to the institutions was raised.

Politics in the College

Tradition has it that the college is above politics. This is based on two beliefs. First, the college is said to be independent of direct influence from external groups that wish to bend the institution to special purposes. Second, because its internal processes of government is staffed by men who are objective and rational by definition, the college is supposedly devoid of the usual manifestations of self-interest and struggle for power which characterize other organizations. The fiction is thus maintained that when one engages in higher education—as a faculty member, as a student, as a president, or as a member of the board of trustees—he is relieved of the usual strain of political processes in our society.

The history of U.S. higher education, however, illustrates that academic institutions *are* political in most senses of the term. External influence controls the sources of funds and affects the student clientele of colleges. Special interests of faculty are represented in the curriculum, in admissions policies, and in decisions concerning growth and development of the institution. Student interests are represented in the proliferation of vocational and preprofessional programs at the expense of liberal studies, in the maintenance of special privileges for fraternities and other social groups, and in the resistance to enforcement of social regulations which would restrict the freedom of the students to manage their own affairs. Alumni groups have often played a controlling part with respect to athletic policies and have protected the fraternity system against modification and improvement.

Thus, academic government, while maintaining the fiction of being apolitical, actually operates on a basis similar to that of other human organizations because it is subject to the influence of interested parties

who struggle for power to implement their own purposes. Clarification of purposes and the fulfillment of functions by the college depend, therefore, on the skill with which leadership is brought to bear on persons and groups in order to reconcile differences and develop support of programs and procedures.

Political processes in the college, as in all organizations, consist of formal and informal elements. The formal elements are the actions of legal and statutory bodies—boards, presidents, faculty senates, etc.—which flow from their discharge of designated responsibility. The informal elements are the actions of individuals or groups who, while having no designated authority, respond to a perceived threat to their interests or a deficiency in the institution by urging action independent of, and often contrary to, the formal structure of government. Both elements in the political process are important to the college and, as will be argued later, effective academic government is often frustrated by a disjunction between the two.

But the political system of the college, while resembling other political systems to some degree, has particular characteristics which are related to the traditions of the enterprise, the nature of the relationships among those in the institution, and the ideology which influences those engaged in higher education.

In contrast to many forms of civil government,[8] collegial government has few formal elements independent of the supreme authority of the board of trustees, i.e., the formal influence of groups and persons—faculty committees, president, etc.—exist at the pleasure of the board and may be withdrawn at will. This is not to suggest that faculty senates, committees and presidents are without influence, but only to suggest that there is a final and potentially absolute authority which can override the interests of all other formal elements of college government.

The presence of a supreme formal authority in college government does not, of course, mean that this authority can be freely exercised without serious repercussions in the institution. Quite the contrary, as will be shown later. In fact, the clear formal structure of college government, with a board of trustees in which legal authority rests, has placed increased emphasis on informal processes as a means of resisting formal action by the board and as a means of settling most questions without tests of strength. Thus, many of the processes of government in the college exist as a result of informal agreements among the interested parties with respect to which areas of decisions are left to subgroups. In addition, boards of trustees often delegate

responsibilities for decisions to presidents or to faculty groups. But these formal delegations of authority may be withdrawn at will and effective college government depends primarily on informal understandings rather than on statutory allocations of responsibility.

To describe the processes by which the modern college is governed it is necessary to note the interests of various groups and individuals which influence decisions and to take special note of the substantial changes which have occurred in recent periods in the ability of these groups and individuals to generate influence. But it is also necessary to take account of the particularities of individual colleges because processes of government in a single college are affected by tradition, by objective conditions which impinge on the college, and by subjective and personalistic factors related to the ethos of the college and to the abilities and predilections of persons who exercise influence on the institutions through force of personality or through the prestige of the offices they hold.

The discussion which follows focuses on developments which are more or less common to the private colleges and, therefore, does not attempt to emphasize the uniqueness of individual institutions. However, except for a handful of colleges which, because of fortuitous circumstances or effective leadership, can legitimately claim distinctiveness, most colleges exhibit similarities which outweigh their unique qualities. This is because the more powerful influences on the American college are precisely those which urge common purposes and policies. The college must reckon with these forces if it hopes to remain in the mainstream of American higher education.

The New Politics of the College

The most striking change which has affected the politics of the modern American college is the decrease in influence of the boards of trustees and the presidents and corresponding increase in the influence—if not the independence—of faculty (and to a limited degree of students). These shifts are largely a matter of informal understanding among the participants, inasmuch as the statutory arrangements continue to concentrate authority in the boards. Nevertheless, the shifts are real and the diminution in the exercise of authority of boards of trustees is everywhere apparent.

During most of the history of U.S. colleges, at least until the early decades of this century, boards of trustees held most of the power. Presidents were their agents for the application of these powers and possessed little independent authority.

As late as the last decades of the 19th century, in one of the colleges studied, the president did not even meet with the board in session. He was required to be on call in an adjacent room to furnish information on the budget, program and staff, but he did not participate in board deliberations. At the close of board meetings he was informed about decisions regarding budget, appointments to the faculty, and rules of procedure, and was expected to see that board decisions were implemented. Faculty were not consulted on fundamental questions, although individual faculty members might, through friendship with board members, offer advice. Students were not consulted.

Inasmuch as faculty during this early period were in effect employees of the board, possessing neither formal nor informal tenure but annual contracts cancellable without hearing or stated reason, they possessed little power to resist the influence of the board. Furthermore,

there were few accepted qualifications for faculty positions and individuals could usually be replaced with ease. In this earlier period there were no organizations of faculty within the institution or on a broader basis to bring influence to bear on boards of trustees.

Students were considered to be wards of the college, possessing neither the maturity nor the power to influence the institution except through spasmodic uprisings—to which the college responded by mass dismissal of students and by occasionally changing academic procedures. For example, the academic calendar was changed in the 19th century to provide extended summer and Christmas holidays as a means of reducing student restlessness. Occasionally, of course, students did influence their colleges but this was usually the result of informal coalitions of faculty and students. Many more such undertakings failed than succeeded.[9]

In the 19th century it was generally expected that boards of trustees would insist that orthodox religious and social ideas would prevail in the colleges. Deviations were severely dealt with. There were, of course, objections when boards punished faculty members, students and presidents for proposing "radical" ideas, but the practice was generally accepted until the 20th century. As late as the 1920s, Veblen could make the important point that boards of trustees continued to be dominated by conservative influences from business and contend that this was a major disadvantage to U.S. higher education.[10]

Secular and pluralistic conceptions of scholarship were rising in America in the late 19th century but they had not yet been institutionalized in the college, although they were the cause of discontent and unrest on many campuses. The needs of the nation for free scholarship and technological training of a higher level were gathering momentum, however, during the post-Civil War period and proved too strong to resist. When they were accepted they fundamentally changed the balance of political process on the campus.

Increasingly during the last decades of the 19th century U.S. colleges looked abroad, particularly to Germany, for models of the new institutions which would be more appropriate to the needs of the nation. The accomplishment of German scholars impressed Americans with the potential advantages of colleges free of those restrictions under which U.S. institutions had operated from the beginning.[11] In addition, American society was breaking free of the influence of ecclesiastical and political groups which had heretofore controlled the colleges.

A new spirit, secular and pluralistic in nature, gradually infused the

system of higher education. One of the principal effects of the new spirit was to develop the professionalization of scholarship. Using the European experiences as a guide, Americans developed graduate and advanced study in the disciplines and several universities and colleges accepted such training as a necessary qualification for faculty appointment. A self-consciousness developed among faculty which had been missing before.

There are numerous symptoms of the increasing professionalization of U.S. college faculty, but the most obvious example was the creation of the American Association of University Professors in 1915. The attention of this group was at first focused on questions of tenure as a necessary condition for free inquiry but it is clear that the general effect was to increase the political power of American professors and create a new balance on the campus.

Having begun to professionalize college teaching and having established a form of training for entry into the profession, faculty became for the first time in our history an important influence in their institutions. They were no longer employees of the college but partners in directing the institutional programs. Having gained some control over entry into the profession, professors could insist on new conditions for the exercise of their functions. In addition, the colleges were rapidly expanding and the resulting need for faculty made it necessary that colleges provide the freedom faculty wished or forego the possibility of securing the best candidates for positions.

The professionalization of scholarship which was institutionalized in the graduate schools expressed three perspectives that were to influence the college: 1) A premium was placed on specialization of study. This was necessary to develop defensible methodology for each field of study and to diminish speculative and therefore "shallow" scholarship which had proved inadequate in the older colleges. 2) The principal emphasis in the graduate schools was placed on research, not on preparation for college teaching. Thus, faculty were increasingly recruited who had little or no experience in teaching and who came to have little regard for the faculty member who "simply" taught. 3) Having sloughed off the moralistic views of college teaching, the new faculty resisted the responsibility for the custodial functions of the college. Their predecessors had been required to live in dormitories, where they regulated student behavior and directed the social life of the students. The new faculty refused these obligations because they were thought to interfere with the work of the scholar and because

such custodial functions seemed inappropriate to the secular and pluralistic temper of the times.

As the new spirit of free inquiry and professionalization of scholarship infused the faculty and became the dominant motif by the 1930s, college students were proceeding on quite a different basis. With few exceptions, students looked upon the college experience as an opportunity to combine modest academic effort with a social life free of restrictions of home and vocational responsibility. Between the last years of the 19th century and the Second World War college students developed a dominant culture which emphasized an active social life. Fraternities had been transformed into purely social organizations during the latter years of the 19th century and were organized principally to promote fun. Interscholastic athletics were developed into occasions for display of school spirit, heavy drinking and weekends during which the new freedom of association between the sexes could be exercised. During this period many students successfully resisted the serious scholarship of the faculty by passively agreeing among themselves that if most set a modest standard of academic effort, all would profit. The goal was to get a "gentleman's C" without unseemly devotion to course work.

An uneasy working relationship thus developed between students and faculty during the first decades of this century. Faculty were gaining increasing freedom to pursue scholarship and to engage in free inquiry while the students were gaining increasing freedom to conduct their own affairs.

Presidents presided uncertainly over a divided and somewhat confused enterprise, paying homage to the new scholarship in the faculty by accepting the badge of respectability, the Ph.D., as a desirable requirement for appointment while leaving the students relatively free to develop their social life so long as excesses did not produce negative reactions from the public. Having diminished influence over both faculty and students, the presidents increasingly concerned themselves with the cultivation of individuals and organizations whose financial and moral support were necessary to the continuation of the institution. Thus, public relations and fund raising became chief responsibilities of college presidents.

Boards of trustees, while giving up a little formal authority, delegated most of the immediate responsibility for operating colleges to presidents and faculties. They gave up almost all direct authority over admission of students, discipline and the curriculum and demanded mainly that the finances of the college be well run and that no serious

faculty or student misbehavior or controversy embarrass the institution. By the late 1940s it was possible for many board members to agree that their most important functions were to see that the money was not wasted or spent without authorization and to elect a new president when that office became vacant.

One crucial characteristic of the new influences on the politics of the U.S. college was that cosmopolitan influences replaced parochial ones. The rise of professionalization of scholarship among the faculty and the development of self-conscious associations of scholars created a group of influences on the individual college which were national, if not international in scope. It became increasingly difficult for individual colleges to resist the standards which were set by the leading graduate schools and the professional associations with respect to the necessary qualifications in order to enter the teaching profession and the necessary conditions for free inquiry and scholarly activities.

In each of the disciplines associations were established which, through meetings and publications, disseminated new research findings and methodology. More importantly, these associations of scholars elevated inquiry and publication to the highest level of visibility. Soon it was customary for large proportions of American faculty to look upon research and publication as the ideal activities in which every faculty member should engage, although repeated surveys of U.S. faculties suggested fewer than 10 percent had either the ability or the inclination to make important contributions in such activities.

Efforts by student leaders to establish effective political organizations of U.S. college students enjoyed less success than in the case of the faculty, but increasing communication among students on various campuses did produce agitation for removal of harsher restrictions on student freedoms in colleges and universities. In the main, however, U.S. students discovered that because most of their colleges were unable or unwilling to enforce regulations regarding their personal lives there was little need to agitate for changes.

It was not until after the Second World War, when large numbers of older and more mature college students were introduced under the auspices of federal aid to veterans, that a serious challenge to student regulations was mounted. The usual response of the college to such pressures was to retreat and to liberalize the regulations.

The result of these developments during the first decades of the 20th century was that many of the particularized influences which had made it possible for a college to be unique—the personality of a president, the social or religious perspectives of patrons, the ethnic or social

characteristics of student bodies, etc.—were undermined in most U.S. colleges and were replaced by influences common to the U.S. pluralism.

While a few colleges retained a certain uniqueness, the expression of uniqueness tended to be superficial and ritualistic. For instance, some church-related colleges retained compulsory chapel but these affairs increasingly tended to become unimportant to both student and faculty. Many were converted into essentially nonreligious affairs and in many colleges substitutions were approved for those students who objected strongly to attendance. Both faculty and students learned to accept certain traditional expressions of uniqueness in their colleges so long as these did not provide more than a superficial guidance for behavior, but it became clear that important standards for decision making in the college had been shifted from an internal, particularistic base to an external, cosmopolitan base. The central influence of the last half century on the political processes of the American college appears to be that the basis for the legitimacy[12] of the use of power in the college by the board of trustees, the president and others, has been transformed from parochial bases related to particular geographic, religious and ethnic relationships to cosmopolitan bases which expressed the values of pluralism and cosmopolitanism.

The steady erosion of religious sanctions as important forces in the political processes of colleges has proceeded to the point where only a few institutions continue to express particularistic points of view with respect to the curriculum and faculty and student behavior. The most recent change in this regard has occurred in the Roman Catholic colleges, where the religious influences on the curriculum, i.e., required religious studies and required attendance at religious services, are rapidly being swept aside. The trend is almost universal and shows no signs of abating. The colleges which represent the remaining exceptions to the trend increasingly find themselves out of the main stream of U.S. higher education and under great pressure to accept the cosmopolitan premises of the modern American college.

The same trend, although with different particular symptoms, is sweeping the tax-supported colleges and universities. The earlier conception of state colleges and state universities as servants of the people of the state, concentrating their studies on the problems of the region, and serving students who were residents of the state has in substantial measure, been swept aside. In the leading state universities, California and Michigan, for example, the major thrust of scholarship and inquiry has assumed national and international dimensions. With

the increasing importance of federal financing to such institutions these universities have, in effect, become national, not state institutions.

So too, but in a lesser degree, the influences of national groups which offer scholarly leadership and financial resources have transformed the colleges. The recent increases in federal financing have increased the cosmopolitan influences on American colleges for the provisions under which federal funds may be granted are all expressions of cosmopolitan, not particularistic perspectives. In almost every regard, therefore, the standards against which the college is judged are cosmopolitan.

The respect with which the individual faculty member is held is largely determined by the reputation of the institution in which he has undertaken advanced study and the reputation he enjoys among colleagues in his field. With respect to its students, the college is often judged by the performance of its graduates in advanced study. Here again the standards are cosmopolitan and not particular.

As influential members of the college attempt to articulate the basis for the exercise of influence—that is, to describe the moral basis of their authority to lead the college—the cosmopolitan view dominates. References to the proportion of Ph.D.s on the faculty, the publications of professors, the power of the college to draw students from wide geographic areas, the success of graduates in securing admission to institutions for advanced study, the success of the college in securing gifts and grants from national agencies, and the relative position of the freshmen class in national rankings of scholastic aptitude have largely replaced references which were once made to the service by the college in meeting local needs, human and material, or success in preparing leaders for a particular religious or geographic area and other particular purposes.

. . . And Some of the Old

To depict the American college as having undergone radical change which upset traditional patterns for influence and authority—while accurate in most senses—ignores persistent patterns of relationships which continue to operate. As with most human associations, the college is both new and old with respect to the ways in which influence and power are exercised.

The persistent patterns of behavior and attitude which remain in the modern college do not, as some observers believe, simply represent unthinking devotion to outworn tradition derived from a romanticized view of a gold age of scholarship which is past. It is true, of course, that many faculty, board members and presidents view the present era of expansion of college enrollment, large classes, and increasing specialization of study as a perversion of the higher learning and, therefore, look to the past for defense against proposed changes in purposes and procedures. But there are more pragmatic reasons for the apparent resistance to change on the part of those exercising authority and influence in the college which have to do with the relationship of the college to society and the nature of the work of the teacher-scholar:

1. There is in the academic world an ideological view of purposes and relationships which provide a measure of stability to the college. This ideology maintains that the professor is devoted to scholarship, not the acquisition of wealth, that all in the college owe allegiance to the idea of free inquiry and that such allegiance transcends personal interests and, finally, that one's college has unique characteristics which deserve loyalty and support. Among faculty the ideology sup-

ports the tradition of a body of equals, making corporate decisions.[13]

As with most ideologies, the academic tradition is more appreciated than acted on but it tempers the relationships in the college and restrains to a degree the urges for power and the exercise of self-interest among the participants. At least it sets the broad parameters of what is considered acceptable public behavior in dealing with controversy and conflict.

The academic ideology, however, provides equivocal guidance to the acceptable ways in which students may participate in influencing decisions in the college. On the one hand, tradition has it that students are too immature for their opinions to be taken seriously but, on the other hand, students—being junior partners in the academic enterprise—have often been consulted and sometimes listened to.[14] Only a few colleges have established procedures for considering student opinions in making college policy, although many use student committees as consultants. The recent increase in student initiative on these matters—student evaluation of teaching, student membership on college committees, etc.—suggests that a substantial change in practice, if not ideology, may be occurring.

While the prevailing elements of the academic ideology represent a selective view of the history of Western institutions of higher education (those traditions which emphasize status and independence are given special attention), the perspective which they encompass provides a rationale for autonomy of the faculty and a basis for resisting the subjection of the college to the pressures of the contemporary society, with its urges for efficiency and practicality.

Up to the present, at least, the ideology of the academic has prized approaches to the resolution of conflict on the campus which minimized public display of power and maximized consensus and compromise. Seldom does a faculty choose to confront a president or a board with direct opposition when alternatives exist, for to do so is considered "unprofessional" and destructive of the public image of the professor who is interested mainly in his own scholarship and teaching. This ideology may be under serious challenge, as witness the recent strikes by professors in a few colleges, the development of collective bargaining units in California and elsewhere, and the refusal of the 1967 meeting of the AAUP to condemn the use of strikes by faculty.

However, the usual response of faculty to conditions which are thought to be destructive of productive professional life is to suffer the conditions while working cautiously and quietly to effect change, or to

move to a position in another college. Such procedures still dominate academic life, but new ones may well replace them in the future.

Students, too, have been inclined to suffer the conditions of their colleges, apparently on the premise that their tenure was brief and they would soon be out of the institution. They have also shown a remarkable tendency to believe that the faculty were better judges of college procedures than were they. It may be too early to tell whether the well-publicized protest by students against the quality of teaching, the disinterest of their colleges in social change, and the parietal rules which govern student life will produce any substantial changes. Several studies indicate that only a small fraction of college students support such protests and the history of college student life suggests that the present interest may give way soon to other activities.[15]

But the threat of student protests and the increased militancy of the faculty are important to the politics of the college because they produce serious public relations problems which the college can ill afford.

The modern college, particularly the independent, liberal arts college operates, then, in a political climate which requires that influence and power be exercised to take account of newly developed cosmopolitan forces which make uniqueness more difficult but in the knowledge that certain traditional forms of internal association and of external relations, while recently modified, are still important.

2. From its beginnings in American society the college has been a mendicant institution, depending on the charitable impulses of the people for its support. In contrast to business enterprises which are financed from sales of services and goods, the college is only partially financed from the student fees (those parallel the payments by customers of business) and must raise the remainder of its budget from other sources. In addition, the college reports no profit, and its products (students) are not easy to judge on merit. In common with the hospital and the orphanage, the college must ask for support because it is engaged in offering services which cannot be paid for by those who benefit.

Thus, the American college has, in part, tailored its purposes and its expenditures to the level of contributions it received from interested patrons. The fact that the principal sources of these funds has shifted from time to time—religious groups and the very wealthy from the Civil War to the early 20th century, to the large corporations, the foundations and legislative groups today—has not fundamentally al-

tered the mendicant quality of the relationship between the college and the society. This is presently observable whether one considers the efforts of state colleges to secure appropriations from their legislatures, applications of colleges for foundation grants, the cultivation of potential donors by presidents, representations for federal funds or the efforts of church-related colleges to secure funds from religious bodies.

Many private colleges have recently sharply increased their charges to students (from 45 percent to 98 percent of annual expenditures are secured from student fees) but this development has serious disadvantages because the college must then fashion its program to anticipated student interests. Furthermore, high charges to students reduce the heterogeneity of the student body and have converted many private colleges to institutions for the well-to-do.

Several economists and educators have recently asserted that higher education should be viewed as a wealth-producing rather than a wealth-consuming enterprise inasmuch as the effect is to add to the national resources. But there is little evidence that the general public is prepared to accept and act on this premise, although some change may be observed among the attitudes of corporations and legislatures.

As a mendicant institution the private college must ordinarily give careful attention to the public interpretations of its activities. It alienates a traditional source of financial support at grave risk and it seeks constantly to publicize evidence of strength and efficient operation. Every disruption of the appearance of harmony is a potential disaster and letters of complaint which charge that the college condones or fails to suppress expressions or actions which are contrary to prevailing mores are given careful attention by most colleges. Only a few can safely ignore such matters either because their financial condition is secure or because their patrons are sophisticated with respect to the purposes of higher education.

It is often thought that because presidents and boards are charged with dealing with these troublesome difficulties they are, therefore, the source of pressures for conformity within the college. Evidence suggests, however, that faculty are affected also, particularly in those colleges which are subject to recurring financial difficulties.[16] While most attention is given to isolated incidents in which pressure for conformity is brought to bear on the college or on a faculty member, the pervasive and unnoticed effects are probably more important.

College students are, of course, less aware of the mendicant quality

of the relationship of the college to the society and more willing to ignore the possible consequences of the alienation of support. Furthermore, they are inclined to view such questions in moral terms and to believe that any compromise of absolute autonomy of the college is a denial of basic purposes.[17]

One need not take the extreme view that U.S. colleges are the creatures of special interests which, under the threat of denial of financial support, deny the free exercise of scholarship in order to recognize that the mendicant relationship of the college to the society is an important factor which affects internal political processes. The situation may have substantially improved since Veblen and others commented on it early in this century but there is still a dependency relationship which must be acknowledged and counterbalanced if possible. Whether the developing trend for private colleges increasingly to seek funds from "disinterested" sources—foundations and governments—will further relieve the situation depends on the widespread acceptance of new philosophy of college-society relations (see reference above to efforts to interpret the college as a wealth-producing enterprise).

On first thought the fact that colleges must seek contributions for support would appear to be a stimulant for change in order that the college could continually present something new and novel to those to whom it appeals for funds. And so it is to some extent, but this factor is also the cause of a considerable degree of conservatism in the college. For those most committed to the academic enterprise, particularly the faculty, sense that there is a danger that solicitation of funds for special purposes may destroy both the freedom of the college to conduct its own affairs and the desirable balance among the several fields of study represented in the liberal arts. The acknowledged fact that funds for special purposes—buildings, research projects, etc.—are easier to obtain reinforces the concern of those who believe that the central values of the liberal arts college are found in a highly developed program of teaching conducted in a closely knit community of teachers and students.

3. Colleges occupy a distinctive place in the social order which is compounded of elements not associated with most other institutions in the society: they are increasingly credited with performing crucial services for the nation because they train the sophisticated workers needed for a technologically oriented society; they provide a means of upward social mobility for millions of Americans;[18] they preserve

and interpret the history of culture for a society which destroys the cultural heritage without regard in order to secure momentary pleasure or advantage; and they offer criticism of a society which exercises its new world position with uncertainty and prefers to believe in the immutable rightness, if not the divinely inspired nature, of its political and social arrangements.

The private college is subject to a special array of reactions to its basic purposes because, while it is free from direct influence of state governments which subject the tax-supported institutions to periodic investigations to ascertain their support of the existing order, it is increasingly attended by students who represent conservative, technologically oriented impulses of the society[19] and it receives much of its support from middle class families that have an interest in preserving their advantages. They hope that their sons and daughters will learn to appreciate the benefits of present social arrangements and be prepared to engage in vocational activities which represent conservative sectors.[20]

Thus, the critical and interpretive functions of many colleges are muted while the technological and supportive functions are emphasized. Even where faculty make special efforts to focus on social criticism there is little evidence that students come to appreciate, let alone act on the implications of such behavior for their own lives,[21] and the college must continually deal with adverse public reaction. It is no wonder, then, that studies of private liberal arts colleges have repeatedly shown a drift toward vocationalism and course specialization.

The politics of the modern college is composed, therefore, of elements which are both new and old: new in the sense that the professionalization of scholarship and the cosmopolitan perspectives have replaced the older views of teaching and the parochial interpretations of purposes, and old in the sense that certain aspects of the academic ideology and some of the basic relations of college to society remain relatively unchanged.

These general developments which affect the private colleges form a backdrop against which the individual college develops its particularities of purpose and procedure. While they cannot be ignored they may in part be counterbalanced by the special interests and inclinations of a board of trustees, a president or a faculty associated with a college because within each college certain persons are able to urge

their points of view with more or less success on the deliberative processes.

The structure of the influence system* in a college depends in substantial measure on the extent to which various groups—boards, presidents, faculty and students—confine their political participation to the protection of "self interest" when compared to their willingness to support action on behalf of general principles or institutional goals. When the self-interest motive dominates, the institution is immobilized because each of these groups can exercise sufficient power to prevent positive action. It is interesting to note in this connection that most attempts to describe the "sociology of the campus" have assumed that each group—administrators, faculty and students—is functionally separated from the others and that meaningful coalescence is difficult, if not impossible (see Freedman on Vassar, etc.). Only when it is possible to develop influence systems which transcend or supplement self-interest is the college able to address itself to major adaptations in purposes or policies.

There can be no doubt that the modern college is fragmented in the sense that it is the arena in which diverse interests are pursued at the expense of institutional unity. (Whether this is a "bad" condition depends on one's views, but at least it prevents discussion of change because it precludes the kind of open exchange of ideas which is necessary.) Whether the fragmentation can be remedied is, of course, a matter of debate. However, the analysis of the roles of the participants which follows is made in the belief that a higher degree of common support can be achieved if the positions of the various participants are understood.

---

* I am using the phrase "influence system" to suggest that the ability of a person, or a group of persons, to get others to act as he wishes is explainable in terms of coincidence of interests, his position of authority and by informal coalitions with others to whom he offers advantages. See Edward C. Banfield, *Political Influence*, New York: The Free Press, 1961, p. 12, for a description of this process in Chicago.

The President

All questions of moment which arise in the college must eventually receive the attention of the president because he alone has the responsibility and the authority, at least potentially, to resolve differences of opinion which may exist among interested parties. As the designated agent of the board of trustees, the only legal authority for the existence of the college, the president occupies a pivotal position in the links of communication which relate the faculty and the students to each other and to the external influences on the institution. While others may express opinions on questions of college policy and procedure, the president speaks *for the college* in a variety of ways: he is expected to interpret the college to the public so that increased interest—and hopefully increased support—will follow; when differences of opinion exist within the college he is expected to rise above the controversy and persuade the dissidents that possibilities for cooperation exist; above all, he is expected to lead the college toward new policies which are appropriate to the changing conditions which affect it.

The resources available to the president in the discharge of these responsibilities are considerable because his office is endowed with formal authority by the board to act for it, with symbolic authority which is a tradition of the office, with information and perspective available to few others in the organization, and often with the implicit authority of the faculty to speak for it. The degree to which a president can successfully use these resources depends in large measure on his understanding of the educational issues faced by the college and on his skills as a political leader, using persuasion when that is possible and more direct forms of political power when necessary.

The decline in unrestrained authority of college presidents which

has occurred in the last century leads many to conclude that the office can no longer provide the leadership it once did. And there is no denying the changes which have occurred. Presidents can no longer use threats of dismissal to coerce faculty nor can they rely on unquestioning support of ecclesiastical or governmental authority for their actions. Subtle forms of political leadership are required and this gives many the impression that presidents lack any real influence in their institutions. It has led one observer to state that presidents (at least in universities) are reduced to "mediators" of conflicting points of view.[22]

Furthermore, the legacy of despotic college presidents who ran roughshod over the legitimate aspirations of faculties for a voice in the government of their colleges has led some to believe that presidential leadership is the chief obstacle to meaningful higher education.

The latter point of view appears to arise in part from the analysis of organizations made popular by Weber and others who conceived of strong leadership as productive of rigid bureaucracy which leads to certain forms of efficiency but which suppresses initiative and innovation. The logical remedy for the evils of bureaucracy from this point of view is collegiality, in which all real power is vested in the faculty, with the president reduced to seeing that faculty policies are carried out and that housekeeping functions are fulfilled.

While there is considerable evidence that the exercise of presidential leadership often leads to the perpetuation of mediocrity and reduces the opportunity for initiative in the college, there is also evidence that the exercise of presidential leadership stimulates needed changes in academic procedures and increases the opportunities for faculty initiative. The case for strong presidential leadership which stimulates improved education has recently been presented in a case study of the University of North Carolina in which it is urged that bureaucratic and collegial elements of academic government need not be incompatible but may, in fact, be complementary and essential to each other.[23]

Whatever the theoretical arguments concerning the nature of leadership in organizations, the college president can hardly avoid the exercise of leadership. It is literally thrust upon him by the nature of his office because he is continually asked to speak for his college and the problems of purpose and function must somehow be resolved.

The problem, therefore, for the college president is not whether he will lead, but how and to what ends. Will he serve to mediate differences among faculty, students and the public in the knowledge that the result will be that a few articulate individuals will shape the col-

lege to their ends or will he use his influence to change opinion and arouse the inarticulate so that more balanced purposes will prevail? Will he allow limited perspectives to determine the direction of the college or will he make sure that the broad range of information about the history of the college, its financial resources, the potential sources of support, its changing functions, etc., are made available to the board, the faculty and the students and are interpreted by him as background for policy decisions? Will he use his stock of influence (which is by nature limited and perhaps especially in the modern period) to win unimportant victories, either because he fails to distinguish among issues or because he wishes to enhance personal prestige, or will he recognize that his influence is limited and must be used carefully on important issues and must, when possible, be converted to authority by the process of legitimization?[24] Will he, through logic based on broad observation and reflection, reformulate the issues being debated in the college from concern with self interest and personal advantage to considerations of central questions of social purpose and individual freedom?

All this requires that the president be a thoughtful analyst of the society and of higher education and that he give careful thought to the political processes of the college.

As with all forms of political leadership, the college presidency may be analyzed by considering the formal and informal sources of its power and influence. The formal sources flow from the president's relationship to the board of trustees. In theory, these are very great. Almost uniformly, college statutes delegate authority for the operation of the college to the president, although some authority is shared with the faculty senate, of which the president is the presiding officer. The president is authorized to communicate with the board and to offer recommendations on budget, staff and planning. He is authorized to speak for the college at public affairs, to negotiate with external agencies for funds and support and to appoint special committees of faculty and students to offer recommendations for the improvement of the college. He occupies a pivotal position because he alone is the authorized link between the internal groups of faculty and students on the campus and the external groups who have an interest in the college. Having access to both information and relationships available to no other person, he has a perspective and a platform from which to interpret the college to a wider audience.

In contrast with other forms of political leadership in the society, especially in municipal and state governments, the college president is

seldom faced with independent statutory authority in his institution.[25] Whatever frustrations college presidents may encounter in the exercise of leadership do not ordinarily arise, therefore, from a lack of formal authority or unworkable arrangements of checks and balances sanctioned by statute.

While the full exercise of the formal authority conferred on the college president is restrained by informal and implicit understandings (which will be discussed later), he still has extensive influence at his disposal. The problem is to convert this latent influence into effective leadership by using it carefully and wherever possible to clothe its use in a "quality of rightness": that is, his actions as president must be placed in a context of a set of persistent, integrated principles which express a doctrine or ideology acceptable to all or most interested parties.

It is precisely at this point that the president must sense the profound changes which are sweeping U.S. higher education, because new ideologies have arisen which make old ones useless. In the last century it was often sufficient for the college president to base his formal exercise of leadership on social or political orthodoxy flowing from sponsorship of the institution. Thus, students and faculty could be dismissed for failure to adhere to the dogma of sponsoring religious bodies or because they supported radical political ideas such as legal recognition of labor organizations. Most of these ideologies have been swept aside in the modern college, and even where external groups wish to maintain them faculty and students will generally give little support to the president who relies on them.

In the modern college the old ideologies have been replaced by demands that the institution defend free inquiry with full access to ideas, spoken and written, and that the personal, social and political acts of faculty and students be free of special restrictions because they are associated with the college. These have become the main sources of principles which the president must use to convert his formal influence to legitimate authority to lead the institution. If he hopes to avoid the use of coercion, an inefficient form of leadership, his leadership must take recognition of the new ideology for it can become the basis of leadership through persuasion.

The interpretation of the new ideology of the campus to the public—particularly to interested patrons of the college—is a formidable undertaking because the American people have a faulty understanding of the purposes of higher education. They are inclined to believe that college students are incapable of thoughtful consideration of diverse

points of view and must, therefore, be protected from "radical" and "subversive" influences: that is to say, many people conceive of the college as an instrument for indoctrination and vocational training rather than as a center of inquiry and liberal education.

Yet, no task of the president appears more essential than to use the resources of his position and office to explain the efficacy of free inquiry for our society. Using the commitment of the American tradition to free speech and free access to ideas, as well as recent evidence, particularly in the sciences, that free inquiry is the source of strength to meet perplexing problems of the common life, he must interpret the new college to the people.

The president faces a corollary but different task of leadership within the college because the faculty and students need an interpretation of their work which clarifies the social ends to be served by scholarship and which justifies liberal studies. Faced with a faculty (most of whom have given several years of effort to the mastery of specialized fields of study and who are under the influence of professional scholarship) which seeks to perpetuate itself, the president must link faculty self-interest to the broader ends to be served. Presiding as he does in many colleges over relatively autonomous departments, each devoted to its area of study and the cultivation of new recruits to it, the president must offer broader interpretations of the purposes to be served.

As a political act the usual presidential interpretation of the problems of the college faculty—which consist in a large part of denunciation of specialized study and the influence of graduate schools—appears ill-conceived, inasmuch as it alienates without suggesting positive action. To be effective, presidential leadership must develop perspectives which utilize, rather than challenge, modern scholarship and which develop the latent humanitarian and liberal impulses of most faculty. The president's task is to articulate these latent impulses and give them form in the college. If the president has faith in the liberal (if often suppressed) views of the faculty and if he has confidence in his ability to articulate the social ends to be served by liberal arts colleges, his leadership can often be decisive.

In order for the college president to have influence, let alone authority, in his relationships with students he must give careful attention to their views (he need not agree with them, of course) and he must develop contact with them so that he can become known. The usual practice—which calls for the president to appear at ceremonial events before students and to confine his acquaintances among stu-

dents to those who occupy elected positions of leadership and the few who seek presidential relief from disciplinary action—provides an inadequate base for political influence.

One of the remarkable developments of recent years is the rise to power of articulate students who, representing the views of a small minority of fellow students, are still able to muster support of large proportions of student bodies. Few presidents are able to influence student bodies who have been aroused to demonstrate for local or national causes and more presidents are unable to secure even a reasonable hearing for their views.

The isolation of presidents from students produces two disabling effects on the potential influence of the former: first, presidents often have no firsthand knowledge of students' point of view and are unaware that legitimate complaints against arbitrary college procedures may not be weighed by faculty and minor administrators; and, second, having no regular and informal association with students, college presidents, like leaders in labor unions and governments who lose touch with constituents, often find that they have no base of influence from which to act.

The formal political capital of the college president is considerable but it must be used sparingly and not dissipated on trivial matters. And it must be supported by political capital arising from informal sources. The latter requires extensive contact with persons inside and outside of the college and imposes heavy burdens on the time of the president. No president can do all that is expected of him, but he can weigh the relative importance of activities and discipline himself to undertake those tasks which are central to his leadership responsibilities. The temptation to spend inordinate amounts of time outside the college is very great, partly because the president senses the importance of external contacts and partly, one suspects, because they offer pleasant relief from the drudgery of the campus. In addition, groups outside the college often pay obeisance to the office (and hence to the person) of the president in ways not customarily followed on the campus.

To argue, as some presidents do, that their chief task is "take care of outside contacts" and to leave internal leadership to deans appears self-deceiving. For if those outside the college demand leadership from the president, so do those on the campus. Few colleges can develop cohesive programs, strong and devoted faculties or enthusiastic students in the absence of presidential leadership. On the other hand, carefully developed relations outside the college are of no avail unless strong and vital programs of education are developed.

Interviews conducted at the six colleges under study as well as published studies of the college presidency indicate either that few presidents understand the need for the exercise of informal leadership or that, while understanding, they are indisposed to act on the understanding. With one exception, the presidents of the six colleges which were studied showed little inclination to utilize opportunities to establish informal relations with students or faculty: they almost never visit faculty in their offices, they seldom frequent locations on the campuses where faculty and students congregate for informal discussion, they repeatedly convert informal occasions into formal and often impersonal affairs through insistence of structuring—setting of time and place, describing agendas, etc. A report on College and University Presidents of New York State indicates that the tendencies observed in the six colleges are endemic in higher education. For instance, less than 5 percent of the presidents' time was spent on "informal interaction with faculty" and 2.5 percent in meetings with students.[26]

The Sources of Presidential Influence

As the designated head of the college, representing both the authority of the board of trustees and to a considerable degree the faculty, as well as the central figure in the chain of informal linkages between internal and external groups, the college president has a variety of sources for his influence:

1. As the principal figure in both the development of financial resources and in the allocation of funds for operation of the college, he is in a position to support some forms of activity and to withhold support from others.

Both the level of financial resources he is able to secure for the college and the circumstances under which they are secured affect the degree to which the presidential influence is enhanced by these activities. A successful effort to increase the funds available to the college produces a climate in which dissidents on the board and in the faculty are reduced in their ability to resist presidential leadership; increased funds make new programs possible and offer hope that faculty remuneration will be increased.

If an increase in the level of financial support can be combined with an increase in the diversity of sources of funds so that flexibility in allocation is available, presidential influence is further enhanced. That is why presidents value gifts and grants for "general" support so highly.

The president must, of course, share his authority to allocate funds for operation of the college with both board and faculty, but it is clear that the fact of financial "health," however widely decisions regarding expenditures are shared, reflects positively on the office of the president.

2. As occupant of an office which has traditionally been highly regarded in the society, the president finds himself in demand for ceremonial appearances in and out of the college. In addition, it is often assumed that he can speak authoritatively on a variety of topics, some related to education and others concerned with public policy.

If he can fulfill the ceremonial functions with dignity and grace—but, more important, if he can speak fluently and cogently on a variety of topics—the president finds a ready audience. Furthermore, success as a speaker adds to the visibility and power of his office.

It should, however, be noted that this potential source of increased influence of the president is often fraught with hazards. For if the president speaks too often and in meaningless rhetoric (as, alas, is the tendency) the faculty and students as well as the more discerning public come to regard him as uninformed and shallow.

3. As the administrative head of the college, the president usually has broad authority to reward or punish members of the faculty and the student body. While he no longer is able to use the threat of dismissal as a principal device for securing compliance with his wishes, the president is able to influence promotion in the faculty and often has broad discretion in the appointment of administrative personnel, deans and department heads, and in appointments to major committees which consider and recommend changes in policies. Furthermore, he can select members of the faculty to play prominent roles in social and ceremonial functions at the college. Contrary to the tradition that faculty care only for their scholarship and their teaching, such visibility is sought often by many faculty (and their wives).

4. As the principal recipient of information and evidence which bear on present functioning of the college, and with numerous opportunities for observation of the forces at work on higher education, the president has the raw material from which he can make analytical and interpretive comments about the college: its present state, its prospects and his plans for improving it. The perusal of presidential addresses and reports is not particularly reassuring on this matter, but the potential is very great as a source of increased influence.

Interviews with faculty and students at the colleges under study as well as careful examination of published statements of the presidents to their faculties on the state of their colleges demonstrate that these presidents (again with one exception) do not base their interpretations of the future of the institutions on evidence at hand. In personal conversations these men were willing to share information about pros-

pects for financing, changes in student clientele, difficulties in recruiting faculty, etc., all of which bear heavily on the present functioning of the colleges and shape planning for the future. They were apparently willing to share this with an outsider committed to confidentiality but they felt that such information could not be shared with those most directly concerned with their colleges because they feared that the result would be a decline in morale.

It can, however, be safely inferred that this unwillingness to engage in candor has certain detrimental effects on the campuses: the possibility that broad understanding of objective conditions, including those which limit the college, might be the basis of increased participation of faculty and students in activities which support the college is prevented; the repetition of statements of hope which have little relationship to reality raises questions of presidential credibility among faculty and students and is a basis of the skepticism with which presidential leadership is greeted.

It is possible to postulate a symbiotic relationship in the fact that in the one college where the president shares information—including negative data—widely with faculty and to some degree with students there is a demonstrably higher degree of commitment by faculty and students to the institution. Interviews with faculty and students in this college revealed that, while they perceived very great difficulties ahead, they were willing to accept problems of funding and resources and spent less energy resisting presidential initiative than in the other institutions.

Such a postulation of relationship between candor and support for leadership is consistent with research into the nature of morale and commitment in other social groups. At any rate, it is difficult to offer any alternative suggestion to those college presidents who wish to legitimize their leadership by developing freely given support from faculty and students.

5. Perhaps the greatest source of presidential influence lies in the personal style of the man because the degree to which he can secure the trust and confidence of faculty, students and trustees depends in large measure on their view of him as leader. As Weber noted, the legitimacy of political leadership may be based on three grounds, one of which is "devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person."[27]

While the personal style of a successful president is partly ideosyncratic and inspirational, it, no doubt, rests on previous acts which

suggests selfless devotion to duty, careful (but not necessarily balanced) analysis of conditions and an ability to interpret the future in a coherent manner. Faced as it is with questions of survival, the private college appears particularly susceptible to the charismatic leader who inspires the faculty and students through his personal qualities.

Presidents of liberal arts colleges, especially those with limited sources of financial support, occupy positions of great difficulty but also, it may be added, of considerable opportunity. While the problems of articulating meaningful purposes of liberal education, of recruiting and holding able faculty and students, of securing adequate financial resources for the institution, and of resisting the strong pressures toward converting the college to a vocational or pre-professional training center are formidable, liberal arts presidents have a wide arena for the exercise of leadership. The grave difficulties which beset the liberal arts college are also the source of the opportunities for the president because most of the faculty and the patrons and many of the students sense that the private college in present-day America is seriously threatened. If the president can give them a sense that he understands what must be done and that he is prepared to work with them in strengthening the institution, the threats to liberal education may well be the occasion for unity and cooperation.

In contrast with the situations faced by presidents of large universities, where formal structures assume dominant proportions and where informal relations are difficult to establish, the college president has the advantage of clear authority flowing from the board of trustees, which can be supplemented by informal relations with faculty and students. This suggests that the presidency of the small college is clearly distinguished from the presidency of a complex university in style, if not in general purpose.

The Faculty

If the role of the college president has a degree of clarity with respect to his sources of influence and the expectation that he will provide leadership to the college, quite the opposite appears to apply to the responsibilities of the faculty. On the one hand, having gained both status and power during the past half century as the result of the professionalization of scholarship and the professionalization of college teaching, faculty owe allegiance to a relatively well-defined set of sanctions flowing from these developments. On the other hand, having an intuitive sense of the importance of liberal education and teaching, but without a clear sense of priorities for their work, and acting under the knowledge that the future of the college may well be in doubt, faculty are uncertain as to their proper political role in the institution.

In addition, faculty have an inadequate base of information and data about their colleges which would provide the necessary perspective for them to participate meaningfully in the discussions of purpose and procedures for the college. This crucial deficiency is, no doubt, the result of their lack of initiative, but it also is the result of presidential inclinations to use exclusive knowledge of the financial and educational situation of the college as a means of enhancing their ability to control decisions.

The situation in many colleges, then, is that the faculty are distrustful of the president, for they do not share his information or his perspective, and their political role is substantially negative. That is, they operate more as a "veto" group than as responsible participants in formulating new programs.[28]

Because they have a clearer understanding of the necessity to protect their professional status as scholars and professors than of their

responsibilities as members of a college faculty, teachers in most colleges chafe under the restrictions which pertain in their institutions. Large numbers of them believe that their presidents would compromise academic freedom and integrity unless they exercised vigilance. Few sense that their presidents have any clear view of liberal education which could guide the development of the college. Even when presidents are clear with respect to the aims of liberal education, many of them find that the habits of suspicion and opposition of the faculty prevent open consideration of these matters.

The nature of the professionalization of scholarship, the rise of self-consciousness of college professors, and the causes which gave rise to these developments are important to the analysis of the politics of the American college because they form the background from which faculty attitudes and habits arise. It may, therefore, be useful to discuss the more salient features of them.

There has been a confluence of forces, represented in the U.S. graduate school, which have formed the particular nature of American academic scholarship and which have given rise to the professionalization of college teaching. These forces developed late in the 19th century as a reaction to the perceived inadequacies of American scholarship and the advantages of foreign academic practices, particularly in Germany.[29] Within a short time, specialized study, with the Ph.D. degree as its symbol, had become the accepted form of advanced study for the prospective college teacher in the United States. While a minority of faculty held the degree, the form of scholarship involved in the Ph.D. affected all advanced study in the graduate schools, with the masters degree becoming a paler version of the Ph.D.

The acceptance of the Ph.D.—or if necessary its captive subordinates, the M.A. and A.B.D.—as the standard preparation for college teaching had several effects on American higher education:

1. It propelled the American college into the modern period of investigation and criticism free from the morally restricted, intellectually stagnant influences which had characterized much of American higher education through its first two centuries. This development paralleled the increasing freedom of the society from ecclesiastical and political conservatism and the growing need of the nation for scholarship, which provided both the ideas and the technology essential to the economic, political and social adjustments necessary to the new industrialization of the country and its rise to full participation as a world power.

The result of this change, after more than a half century, is to place American academic scholarship at the center of the powerful influences in the nation and to revolutionize the nature of liberal education by replacing speculative and moral conceptions with emphasis on the separate disciplines and their associated methodologies.

To argue, as many do, that the latter development has destroyed the "unity" of knowledge and the integrity of liberal education has considerable merit but fails to negate the obvious advantage of modern scholarship over the older forms which it replaced, with their tendency to vague moralism and their de-emphasis of evidence and criticism.

2. The acceptance of the Ph.D., and its explicit definition of scholarship, as a desirable prerequisite for the college teacher introduced the process of professionalizing college teaching because it provided a control on those who might enter the field. In an earlier period, college faculty were chosen from among those thought "suitable" to teach the young, with no definite preparation required. This gave boards of trustees and presidents almost complete freedom in setting the conditions under which professors would carry out their duties and allowed them to dismiss faculty whose personal conduct or unorthodox teaching failed to satisfy the predilections of the sponsoring agencies, the authority of the board or the preferences of the president.

Efforts to establish academic freedom for professors in U.S. colleges foundered until criteria for admission to the profession were initiated and until the development of a definite form of training in the graduate school. After that professors became more self-conscious and hence more influential in their relations with boards and presidents.

The American Association of University Professors, established in 1915 to give college teachers a national voice in the development of the profession, was initiated over the issue of academic freedom and has largely concentrated on that matter and the improvement of faculty salaries, although it has also given some attention to working conditions and to the ethics of the profession.

The professionalization of college teaching has, of course, changed the politics of the college, for it increased the influence of the faculty and decreased the ability of the board and the president to make decisions without considering the effects on teaching and scholarship. The practical effect has been to replace the old sanctions arising from religious and social outlook of the administration with sanctions which are based on professionalized and secular academic scholarship.

3. The establishment of difficult and prolonged programs of advanced study for the Ph.D. as preferred preparation for college teaching created a scarcity of candidates for college faculties. It erected intellectual and economic obstacles for those considering such a career and, therefore, limited the number of new, fully qualified college teachers available during a period of rapid expansion of college enrollment. This chronic shortage of Ph.D.'s has had a substantial effect on faculty attitudes and hence on the politics of the college. Knowing they were in short supply and that they might move with relative ease to positions at other colleges, faculty members have negotiated from a position of strength. Until recently they have used this bargaining power with a degree of gentility, but there is evidence that many may soon adopt more direct methods.

Whatever may develop in this regard, the last half century has witnessed the rise of faculty influence. Part of this rise is attributable to a supply and demand balance which has been favorable to the college teacher.

4. The accepted form of preparation for college teaching, the Ph.D., has not generally been developed as specific training for that profession but as preparation for the career of scholar in a discipline or field without regard to whether the recipient is to teach, engage in research for government or industry or otherwise participate in work calling for analytic and verbal skills. Thus, in contrast to training for other professions—medicine, for example—study for the Ph.D. avoids "clinical" training in the profession and has given almost no attention either to analysis of the conditions under which professional work will be carried out, to appropriate ethics for the profession, or the historical and social influences which affect the modern college. While there are cogent reasons which justify the avoidance of "professional" training of college teachers (the excessive professional courses which have characterized the training programs for high school and elementary school teachers and the lack of appropriate source materials to describe the profession of college teaching are, no doubt, two important reasons), the result has been to introduce into college faculties new teachers without clearly reasoned views of the obligations or the opportunities of their chosen profession. As a consequence, most college faculties are clearer about the profession of scholar than of teacher and are almost totally unprepared to participate in thoughtful consideration of educational policy and institutional purposes.

The professionalization of academic scholarship and the rise of

self-consciousness among faculty are not, of course, equally apparent in all U.S. colleges. Certain church-sponsored institutions and some state colleges have successfully resisted the trend, although their difficulties have recently increased and they may soon move into the modern period. At any rate, they are the object of pressure from the profession and continually remind other college teachers that they must safeguard the gains which they have so recently won. One wonders whether the attention focused on a handful of institutions which violate the accepted standards of academic freedom is not in part a device used to avoid careful consideration of the failure of most college teachers to use their freedom fully and to extend it to their students.

As a political force in their colleges faculty usually confine their action to questions of admission procedures, graduation requirements, academic calendars, social regulations for students and the use of their veto power over proposals made by the board and the president. They almost never initiate fundamental changes in the purposes or the procedures of the college—partly because they give so little consistent attention to such matters and partly, one suspects, because their professional preparation failed to develop either the background or the perspective necessary to deal with such complex matters.[30]

Although many of the developments which have changed faculty attitudes and perspective during the past half century appear antagonistic to the welfare of the private, liberal arts college, there are also reasons for optimism. If the college accepts the premises of modern scholarship and encourages the liberal and humanitarian impulses of its faculty, many of the negative effects can be converted to strength. Perhaps as never before, the profession of college teacher is attracting able and devoted talent to its ranks. These teachers are unprepared for their responsibilities in many ways but—given enlightened leadership and the opportunity to exercise initiative—many will be willing to help revitalize their colleges.

The Students

It is widely believed that college students are currently exercising more influence on their institutions than previously. Those who assert that student influence is growing note substantial numbers of instances of student demonstrations aimed at forcing colleges to modify parietal rules and academic procedures. As a result of student insistence some colleges have discontinued sending class rankings to Selective Service Boards. Other colleges have changed the rules under which students live in dormitories. Still others have modified disciplinary procedures.

But the fact remains that in most colleges student influence is indirect and often peripheral to the central purposes and procedures of the college. Even where students have mounted massive and disruptive campaigns of protest which force their institutions to deal with them (as at the University of California, Berkeley, 1964-65), limited change seems to result.[31]

The reason for the belief that students are exercising increased influence on their colleges appears more related to the methods which have been employed by some student groups than to evidence that fundamental changes have resulted. The use of direct action methods, such as the sit-ins and picketing, has given weight to the argument that student influence is growing. In addition, the publicity which has been given students of the radical left—such as Students for a Democratic Society—who have attacked the basic premises of the modern college and university suggest a new political force in American higher education.[32]

The modest effects of student activism in securing fundamental changes in the purposes of higher education and the relations of the

college to the society (many student activists criticize the "technocratic" orientations of curricula and the degree to which the college supports the status quo) should not obscure the success which they have achieved in securing relief from the oppressive and arbitrary procedures used by colleges to prevent student exercise of academic freedom, their right to ordinary civil rights and to fair and impartial hearings when accused of transgressions of college rules. But student success in these matters is due in substantial measure to the coincidence of such interests with broader impulses in the society to extend civil rights and due process to groups not previously accorded these fundamental American rights. Thus, when students have pressed such questions in the college, professors and interested groups external to the college (the American Civil Liberties Union, for example) have supported their claims as consistent with their support of these same rights for other groups in the society traditionally excluded from the protection of the Bill of Rights—the poor, Negroes, etc.

Whatever may develop in the future, the influence of students on their colleges appears to be limited at the present time and may, in fact, be less than it was in the mid-19th century when shrinking enrollments forced many colleges to cater to student desires for increased freedom and for more vocational training.

The *potential* influence of students on the private college is, of course, very large because in many colleges they bear a large part of the operating costs through payment of tuition. Their reactions to the college may well affect the drawing power of the institution in the future: as graduates, they constitute the principal demonstration of the quality of the college and as students they informally transmit impressions of the college to potential freshmen and their parents. When unified, students have the power to disrupt the operation of the college, to create serious public relations problems and to force administrative changes.

But the main influences of students on the college are more subtle and indirect because they seldom form a unified, direct action political force which can be sustained over a period of time sufficient to counteract faculty and administrative continuity.[33] Furthermore, student influence is seldom effective unless it is allied with faculty influence.[34]

One example of indirect but successful student influence on colleges can be traced by noting the rise in importance of the social sciences in the curriculum and the relative decline of the humanities and some of the natural sciences. While several factors produced these changes, it can hardly be argued that increased student interest and

enrollment in psychology, sociology and political science were not central. Student reactions to educational innovation also control to a substantial degree the capacity of the American college to make fundamental changes in instructional programs and procedures: student resistance in many places to year-round operations have forced colleges to abandon trisemester plans; freshman seminar and independent study programs must win the approval of a substantial number of students in order to continue.

Recent attempts by students to exert direct influence on their colleges suggest the following general conditions:

1. While most student bodies do not operate as organized, self-conscious interest groups, they can at times and for short periods express strong opinions on specific issues which cannot be ignored by the college. Such expressions occur mainly when traditional rights of students are threatened—as at Berkeley, when the university threatened to withdraw long-standing privileges of student groups to solicit support for political and social action at a main entrance; when a college policy directly and specifically supports what students consider an "immoral" condition—racial discrimination in off-campus housing approved by the college; or when the college appears to compromise freedom of expression—dismissal of professors or student editors under pressure from outside groups.

In such situations, a small number of students provide leadership to arouse substantial student support. This is possible because most students feel little personal allegiance to the president of the board and, in many cases, feel that they must "protect" the college from the administrative agents.

2. There is not now, nor has there ever been, an influential national student movement offering an ideology or a strategy in support of local student bodies. The several recent attempts to develop a national student consciousness—the U.S. National Student Association, Students for a Democratic Society—have failed to secure general student support probably because of the cosmopolitan, heterogeneous nature of American college students, because college students enjoy easy entry into the job market and, perhaps most importantly, because college faculties and presidents have, at least in contrast with Asian and South American counterparts, shown more imagination and more flexibility in dealing with student complaints. Thus, the predictions that the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley or the Free University movement at several universities will develop into national movements fly in the face of our history.

3. As expressions of organized student opinion and as instruments for conversion of student opinion into influence on the college, officially recognized "student governments" appear remarkably ineffective. Whether this is because of the quality of students usually elected to major offices, because these organizations have typically concerned themselves with activities which are peripheral to the college—social activities and student organizations—or for some other reason is unclear.

What is clear is that the most vigorous and most articulate student critics of the college do not ordinarily express themselves through student government nor do they utilize existing structures of student organizations to develop mass support.[35]

4. The principal leverage which is available to students who wish to urge a change in their colleges is to create public incidents which upset the equanimity of the institution. Students know that such incidents will be reported in the press and will frustrate one of the goals of the board and the president: to create the public impression that the college is efficiently administered and enjoys the loyalty of faculty and students.

Much attention has been focused during the past few years on the question of whether U.S. college students represent a new generation which has little in common with the general society and the adults who administer and teach in the colleges. Both those who hope for a revolution in American morality and those who fear substantial changes have offered opinions that students are increasingly idealistic and radical and that substantial numbers of them reject the basic assumptions of the present culture.

Review of several studies of student characteristics do not, however, support such assertions. Several investigators have collected survey data which portray the dominant student profile as middle-class, conservative representatives of the families from which they come. However, because many are late adolescents and because many find the academic programs of their colleges unsatisfactory, there is considerable dissatisfaction among college students, particularly on the part of the more able ones.[36]

Data which have been collected from the six colleges under study here indicate clearly that students in these colleges are basically conservative in outlook and are more interested in achieving personal satisfaction and status than in participating in social revolution. In general, they have favorable opinions of their teachers but view the administration of their colleges with some suspicion. They exhibit

modest feelings of loyalty to their colleges. A high proportion are unconcerned about civil rights and world affairs.

To deny the presence of massive student support for a radical ideology leaves one, however, with the question of why there is increased student unrest on college campuses and why student demonstrations against college policy are staged more and more frequently. The explanation may lie in an analysis of the political processes of the college, of which the main elements are:

1. The dominant perspectives of the faculty: professionalization of scholarship and the rejection of restrictive conditions related to religious or social relationships of the college, and the dominant perspectives of the students: self-development and a degree of personal freedom, while disjunctive at several points, can coalesce on specific issues. When they do find agreement—as in rejection of restrictions on free inquiry etc.—common cause against the president or the board may result. Faculty and students, while comprising distinctive sub-cultures on campus, do find increased reason to support cosmopolitan and secular views of higher education and to resist parochial and particularistic premises.

While faculty may reject the more active forms of student protest, they offer implicit support, if not approval, for student reaction against parietal rules and undue restriction of political and social action. When faculty are confronted with student demands that curricula and courses be modified they are, of course, inclined to resist what they view as an intrusion into their domain. This is why student demonstrations against "poor reaching" and "irrelevant" curricula do not ordinarily achieve much.

In general, the faculty and student cultures find it possible to coexist within reasonable limits: the faculty is free to engage in scholarly activities so long as it imposes modest loads on the students and the students are free to engage in an active social and political life so long as they fulfill the academic requirements and do not seriously disrupt the college. Several recent instances have occurred in which majorities of college faculties have supported student demands for increased freedom from restrictions or in which faculty-student groups have easily reached substantial agreement on proposed changes in student regulations. There is evidence that such alliances will be common in the near future.

2. When one considers the perspectives of presidents and boards —based on the careful weighing of the multiple interests which bear on the college and the need to present a public image of a well-run

harmonious institution—and contrasts these with student perspectives, the possibilities for conflict are more immediately apparent. In addition, many of the more articulate and more able students are under the influence of an intellectual mood which is anti-institutional in nature. This point of view, which is strongly held by only a few students but which can be effectively used to arouse others, is not a critical view of the social order which proposes change in order to improve the conditions. It is instead an expression of a basic distrust of society, the institutions which it supports and, perhaps most crucial, of the possibility that orderly change can be achieved. It is revolutionary in concept and appeals to the nihilistic dispositions of students.

The efforts of college presidents and boards to deal directly with small groups of able students who articulate this extreme view have generally proved unrewarding. There is, in fact, little that can be meaningfully discussed between them (see the record of attempts at Berkeley to arrange meetings between leaders of student revolt and administrators). If the leadership of such students is to be kept within reasonable bounds, they must be suppressed (this is not a practical course of action, given the current mood of the faculty and the students) or the president must build closer relationships with the majority of students who can be relied on to support more moderate views.

But the evidence suggests that administration-student relations are not productive of such trust and cooperation (the data from the colleges under study show that students feel that the faculty are allied with them in opposition to the administration) and will not be until action is undertaken to construct a political basis for cooperation. The recent increase in the appointment of students to college committees charged with developing policies is, of course, a move in the right direction but needs to be supplemented by other actions by the president to establish closer relations.

In addition, fundamental changes in the conceptions of students' rights and freedoms is required in order to remove the present basis for much student suspicion and complaint. The recently issued "Joint Statement on Student Rights and Freedoms," provides a guide to the changes which are needed.[37]

Boards of Trustees and the Public Interest

Under the U.S. system state governments are charged with primary responsibility for education and private colleges are chartered by the states, with boards of trustees as the repository of powers delegated by the civil government. Thus, trustees formally represent the public interest to be served by the college and most boards give some attention to expressions by individuals and groups who wish to urge some action on the institution. But in practice it is the president who must deal with most of the external influences on the college.

The balance of these influences has shifted remarkably in recent years. A century ago external influences on the college were confined largely to representation by sponsoring agencies (often religious groups), by alumni of the college and by local commercial and political interests. To these have now been added influences representing associations of colleges, the scholarly fields, the federal government, and organizations representing a variety of specific and general causes such as civil rights, academic freedom for professors and students, etc.

Because they have limited time and because the external influences are complex, trustees seldom deal directly with the educational groups which influence the college, preferring to leave this to the president, who periodically reports to the board. In the case of representations by parents of students, local political or social groups or religious organizations, the board is likely to feel more competent and, therefore, to take a more active role. Whatever the particular preferences of the board and the president, a high degree of understanding is essential if the college is to deal adequately with the external influences and avoid responses which will distort the educational functions of the institution.

In contrast to systems of college government in other countries, which vest authority in centralized governmental agencies or which vest authority in internal faculty groups, the U.S. system provides that supreme authority for the college shall be vested in a board of trustees, almost none of whom are members of the college staff (the exceptions are that many presidents serve as board members and in rare cases faculty may serve on boards). Our system was obviously designed to avoid governmental control of colleges but it was also designed to provide direct representation of public interest in the control of the college. One result has been that a delicate balance of powers exists between the public interests and the internal interests in the college. This depends on informal understandings among the participants. Another result has been that external influences on the college by individuals and groups are stronger than they appear to be in countries with other structural arrangements for college government.

Because external influences are of considerable moment to U.S. colleges and because the balance of these influences has recently shifted, the political processes in the colleges have been seriously affected. While the particular shifts in these external influences vary from college to college, certain general changes are observable and to some degree affect most of our institutions.

Although the college must meet certain general requirements of the civil authority, in practice even these general requirements are administered with restraint because of our accepted principle that each college—at least the private ones—should be allowed broad latitude to develop and conduct its educational program free from close governmental regulations.

During recent years, however, the federal government and some state governments have shown increased interest in the private colleges and the public services which they perform. Increasingly public funds have been made available through aid to students, grants for construction, etc., to these colleges, with a corresponding rise in the regulatory functions of government. In addition, several state governments have acted to reduce discrimination based on race, creed or color in admitting students and the civil courts have shown more concern for the civil rights of students and faculty.[38]

In spite of these recent developments in governmental influence, the principal external influences on the conduct of education in the private college continue to be exerted by voluntary associations, the professional societies and special interest groups. The educational

associations and the professional societies developed as the alternative to governmental regulation in order to assure minimal academic standards—through accreditation procedures—and to provide channels so that professionalized scholarship would infuse the undergraduate college. These bodies now constitute a considerable influence on the colleges and inhibit the ideosyncratic tendencies of boards, presidents and faculties. They probably also inhibit experimentation in the college.

Depending on the legal and historic connection of the college with religious, social and commercial groups, the private college is subject to varying degrees of influence representing both specific and general interests. The degree to which such interests may have a crucial bearing on the college is a function of complex factors, including the degree of enlightenment with which the special interests are urged on the college, the legal basis on which special interest is based (some church-related colleges are owned by parent religious organizations), the extent to which faculty and student values and attitudes are congenial to parochial—as opposed to cosmopolitan—interests and, perhaps more importantly, the degree to which the college is dependent on special groups for its financial support.

In general, those external influences which are cosmopolitan and secular have grown in power during the past half century while those which are special and parochial have declined.[39] But this general trend is not everywhere apparent and the precarious financial condition of many private colleges leaves many susceptible to special interests. Few can ignore them completely. Except for a few colleges which find their rationale in the religious principles of sponsoring churches, private colleges weigh special interests only when these have a direct bearing on student enrollment and on financial support.

Beyond meeting the requirements of agencies of civil government and the minimal standards of its regional association in order to maintain accreditation, both of which impose modest restraints on the independence of the college, the private colleges confront an array of external influences. While the forces acting on each college are in a degree unique to it, certain general trends are observable:

1. The regional associations of colleges and secondary schools have acted mainly to require minimum conditions for accreditation—adequate numbers of faculty with standard training, basic library collections, acceptable financial practices and orderly processes of academic government. In addition, they have acted to protect state-

supported institutions from blatant political interference although they have refrained from acting when private colleges have been under undue influence of ecclesiastical or social groups, even when traditional academic procedures have been compromised. While most regional associations have allowed individual colleges broad latitude in developing particular purposes and procedures, they have not actively supported experimentation nor have they supported radical departures from typical collegiate structures and functions.[40]

2. The professional societies have mainly influenced the college by insisting on acceptable programs of pre-professional study in their fields. Thus, the American Chemical Society has examined colleges to see whether they adequately prepared students for advanced study in chemistry. The influence of these societies has encouraged departmentalization in the college with professional, if not vocational, emphasis and they have helped institutionalize the modern forms of scholarship in the college.

3. A series of voluntary educational associations—among them the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, the Association for Higher Education—have, through conferences, publications and special committee reports, exerted influence on the colleges. They have often taken public positions on controversial issues and have thereby helped resolve the issues on individual campuses but their main contributions have consisted in providing opportunities for exchange of information among colleges. Thus, the growth of general education during the 1930's and the more recent interest in programs of independent study were both stimulated, if not initiated, by the educational associations.

4. Perhaps the most remarkable change in the nature of external influences on private colleges has occurred with respect to the influence of religious bodies on the institutions they sponsor. In general, the purposes which prompted many churches to sponsor (if not to support) colleges have been frustrated and the former relationship is in disarray, if not dissolution. Only a few religious bodies now believe, as most did formerly, that justification for sponsoring colleges can be based on the premises that such institutions produced ardent supporters of the church, as well as future ministers who would promulgate the faith. In most denominations both have been proved false, inasmuch as the college often produces skeptics and critics who

agitate for change in the church and because the training of ministers is increasingly the province of the seminary and the university.

In addition, religious bodies now provide a small, in some cases infinitesimal, part of the financial needs of their colleges. There is little prospect that this will change.

The result is that the influence of religious bodies on their related colleges has decreased and in many instances can be found only in peripheral and limited activities: the church may insist on student regulations which technically prohibit the use of alcohol, etc., but which have little effect on student behavior; the church may maintain a campus minister and a place of worship but the crucial questions regarding purpose and procedure in the college are hardly affected.

5. Most private colleges must conduct annual campaigns to persuade individuals and organizations to contribute funds in support of the operating costs of institutions. This is necessary because costs have been rising sharply during the past two decades and few colleges have sufficient income from endowed funds and student fees to offset these increases.[41]

While there are encouraging indications that individuals, corporations and foundations are aware of the needs of the private colleges, the fact remains that most of these institutions must work vigorously to secure sufficient funds. The long-range prospects are far from bright.

The dependence of the college on voluntary contributions in support of the annual budget exposes the institution to influence from individuals and groups in direct and indirect ways. Care must be taken to maintain contact with prospective donors. Public relations programs must try to present a favorable impression of the college. Actions of faculty or students which violate the mores of supporters of the college must be discouraged or at least muted. Departures from traditional academic programs must be carefully weighed and interpreted so as to avoid alienation of patrons. Thus, the internal operations of the college and the exercise of influence and leadership are affected, in most cases toward a conservative position.

The Questionable Future

In recent writings which describe the state of American higher education, predictions abound that the private, liberal arts college will die, or that it is dead and doesn't yet know it. And there *is* reason for those who prize such institutions to be greatly concerned. As institutions, they face formidable challenges, which must be overcome. Yet, as Mark Twain once said in response to news of his death, the report may be slightly exaggerated.

Even if the private colleges continue to exist—and this appears to depend greatly on massive injections of public funds in one way or another—the persistent problems of purposes and procedures remain to be solved. Some may prefer to remain in their present states of immobility and uncertainty in the knowledge that, for the foreseeable future, a reasonable supply of students and faculty is likely. Many American families prefer to send their sons and daughters to the protective environments which many private colleges offer. To choose this course, however, seems certain to lead the private college to irrelevance because it will serve custodial and social purposes more than intellectual purposes. Furthermore, it will become increasingly isolated from the mainstream of academic scholarship and intellectual ferment.

Whatever future awaits the private colleges in the United States will depend in part on the perceptiveness and skill with which leadership is exerted to develop a sense of common purpose among those who study and teach in them and those who support them. The leadership must, of course, arise from various quarters. No single person can provide the strength needed to overcome the feelings of futility and uncertainty which characterize many of these institutions. But

the presidents have special responsibilities, inasmuch as they alone can focus the loyalties of students, faculty and supporters on the significant service which these institutions can perform and persuade them that self-interest must be set aside in its favor.

The most important characteristic of the political system of the colleges under discussion is that the power to veto outweighs the power to adapt and to initiate change. In spite of a clear formal structure of authority, with boards of trustees at its apex, effective power is so broadly dispersed as the result of informal understandings that it is difficult for presidents, boards of trustees and faculty leaders to exercise their authority. When they attempt to do so, resistance is almost sure to develop among faculty and student groups. Thus, effective government (at least in terms of the ability to initiate change) is frustrated in the college.

In the colleges which were included in this study the political processes are marked by a high degree of student and faculty abstention. Only a few faculty and very few students have interested themselves in attempting to influence the basic purposes of the colleges by organizing opinion in support of changes. Most of both groups are uninvolved: they lack a base of information about their colleges and current developments in American higher education. Except in "crisis" situations, they take no stands with respect to decisions and they reveal little or no feeling of responsibility for the future of their institutions.

Those few faculty and students who do press for change are, therefore, faced with the problem of "politicizing" the campus by exploiting whatever difficulties are at hand. They do so by engaging in excessive rhetoric and by attacking the status figures in the administration and on the board of trustees. Inasmuch as these figures have no viable social connection with the majority of persons in the college, they offer attractive targets for the activist faculty and students.

Presidents and board members suffer two major handicaps in exercising leadership in such situations: 1) they have little sense of the attitudes and opinions held by faculty and students, and hence their decisions are often taken in ignorance of the likely effects on campus morale; and 2) being remote figures to many students and faculty, their decisions lack authenticity for the college community.

In the interviews conducted on the campuses under study the perceptions of purposes and prospects for the colleges which were expressed by presidents, faculty and students were sufficiently disjunctive to sustain the view that these were divided communities. Few faculty

or students shared the presidents' perceptions of restraints imposed on the colleges by financial limitations, nor were they aware of the efforts of the presidents to resist the pressures of external groups to bend the colleges to their purposes. On the other hand, most presidents were unaware of the frustrations expressed by students and faculty with respect to the exercise of initiative and freedom, which, of course, are the basis of feelings of self-worth and dignity. Until these members of the college achieve a higher degree of shared perceptions, there is small prospect that these colleges will function as communities.

A basis for community exists in common efforts to develop specific purposes for each of the colleges under discussion. When presidents, faculties and students have faced the objective conditions under which the college operates—budget, student clientele, possible social role, etc.—and have developed programs which are appropriate to these conditions, a sense of common purpose is possible. In the absence of that undertaking the present divisiveness is likely to continue, if not grow.

The cycle of distrust, in which individuals and groups perceive others as incapable of responsible participation in efforts to improve the college, can be broken if all are stimulated to work on matters which transcend their narrow interests. The president is the key to breaking the cycle. Unless the president demonstrates his belief that others can join him in promoting the welfare of the college, faculty and students are likely to continue to feel a measure of alienation from the institution.

As noted earlier, the data collected from students and faculty indicate a considerable, although not universal, latent loyalty to the college. Only a few students and faculty are hostile to their institutions and the best hope of containing and redirecting these hostilities is broad participation by students and faculty in decision-making processes, with the possibility for influence open to all.

Among the several possible reasons for the unwillingness of the college presidents to encourage broad participation by faculty and students in decision-making activities may be the public expectation that presidents should "run" their institutions. During the interviews with the presidents in the colleges under study, and in conversations with presidents of other colleges, note was often made of the messages regularly received from persons external to the institution which asked for direct action by the president. The public apparently views the college presidency as a powerful office which can impose its will

on the campus. Most presidents report that they find it difficult to explain the need for consultation and discussion before taking action urged by those outside the college. The fact emphasizes the need for presidents to transform the general view of their offices and the colleges which they lead to one more appropriate to the political realities which are the subject of this report.

As earlier noted, faculty are ill prepared by their graduate schools to assume their full responsibilities as participants in college government. The typical new faculty member has been trained in his field of specialization with little or no attention paid to the nature of American colleges or the problems now besetting liberal education. He assumes his position on the faculty in the expectation that he can concentrate his efforts on teaching and research in his field and leave college government to others. When conditions limit his ambitions—personal and professional—he tends to complain and do little else because he lacks the perspective and the opportunity to assume full partnership in working to remedy the difficulties.

While some recent developments suggest that U.S. graduate schools now recognize their lack of attention in providing prospective college teachers with "intern" training for their careers, there is little indication that the graduate schools are prepared to consider incorporating experiences in graduate training which might produce new faculty better prepared to assume their proper functions in the college government.

In the absence of appropriate internships in the graduate schools, the burden of inducting new faculty into their full roles must be assumed by the colleges which employ them. And there is reason to believe that this can be successfully done if reform in the processes of college government suggested above is accomplished.

To conclude, as some persons have, that faculty are incapable of allegiances except those related to their professional associations and to the status systems which prize visibility based on research and publication must be judged as "not proven." Until these present dispositions have been tested against the possibilities which could flow from active, responsible participation in planning the future of their colleges under candid leadership which accepts faculty as full partners, it seems safer to conclude that faculty allegiance to their disciplines at the expense of their collegiate responsibilities is the result of default more than basic values.

The excessive rhetoric associated with discussion of the part students should play in college government tends to obscure the poten-

tial contribution which they can make to rational consideration of purposes and procedures. Those who argue for increased student participation often seem revolutionary and destructive in intent: the use of the slogan "student power" has been taken to mean that students wish to become dominant in the college. Those who wish to protect administrative and faculty prerogatives accuse students of immaturity: note is taken that students sometimes fail to fulfill those responsibilities already available to them.

Careful review of the experience of those few colleges which have involved students in college government and the reports of surveys of student attitudes and values argues, however, that students are capable of responsible participation in decision-making *if* appropriate structures for student expression are available and *if* full information about the college is provided.

If U.S. colleges continue to resist the incorporation of students into the processes of college government, the prospects for disorder and protest are very high. In the absence of accepted procedures for student expression and unless students feel that they can influence their colleges, it appears likely that undergraduates will increasingly respond to the leadership of those few students who argue that the college is dominated by administrators and trustees who are unresponsive to the moral and social issues of the time.

If, however, students are incorporated into collegiate government the chances are increased that the present level of student alienation will be reduced and that essentially orderly discussion and action can replace overt attempts to disrupt the college. Considerable effort will need to be made to educate students to their new responsibilities. Occasional lapses from orderly processes should be anticipated but there is small reason to doubt that gains will outweigh the difficulties. A large percentage of students will support rational consideration of change and will ally themselves with faculty and administrators who ask for their help and advice.

This study has confirmed the common observation that collegiate government is in a state of disarray and is ineffective in several important regards. However, causes for ineffective college government do not lie—as some would argue—in the presence of obstreperous students and uninterested faculty on the campus but rather in the failure of the private college to adapt to modern conditions of society and the scholarly world. Above all, ineffective college government results from inadequate views of the nature of the college presidency. Both the holders of this office and those who advise them have

failed to grasp the changes which have transformed the leadership function.

There is little evidence that most college leaders have accepted the implications of the changes in relations and attitudes which have developed in this century. They are, therefore, ill-equipped to function effectively. To recapitulate, three serious deficiencies are apparent:

1. The shift from parochial to secular and pluralistic premises, which provides the present basis for scholarship and for social outlook, has not been incorporated into the colleges. Instead, most colleges have attempted to embrace these premises without fully accepting the implications, as witness the repeated retreats from modernity when the college is challenged by parochial pressures.

2. The erosion of absolute authority of presidents and boards has left the college without viable means of resolving issues and prevents change and adaptation. Until workable arrangements for sharing power are developed with faculty and students (which, of course, is far removed from the usual fear that faculty and students wish to "run" their colleges), there is little prospect that a sense of community can be achieved and fundamental changes made.

3. The prevailing style of presidential leadership is inappropriate to the modern college because it assumes that the president's authority derives from his relationship to the board of trustees and fails to recognize that it must be legitimized in the collegial setting.

Once these deficiencies have been remedied, the way is open for the private college to consider to what specific purposes it will address itself. In the absence of these changes, private colleges are likely to continue to be divided communities, unable to focus their resources —material and human—on any viable priorities except those derived from the protection of self-interest and status goals.

NOTES

[1] A recent, but unexceptional, statement of the cosmopolitan and secular views which now dominate American colleges was issued by a committee of Roman Catholic educators in which they defined the "Nature of the Contemporary Catholic University." They declared: "This means that the intellectual campus of the Catholic university has no boundaries and no barriers. It draws knowledge and understanding from all the traditions of mankind. The whole world of knowledge and ideas must be open to the student; there must be no outlawed books on subjects." (*New York Times*, July 30, 1967, p. 56.) Obviously the statement applies to the colleges, as well as the universities.

[2] A recent study of church-related higher education reported that these institutions received on the average only 12.8 percent of their educational and general income from official church sources and that 26 percent of these colleges and universities received none at all, while only 5 percent received as much as half of their income from church sources. (Manning M. Pattillo and Donald M. Mackenzie, *Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States*, Washington: American Council on Education, 1966, p. 43.)

[3] For a recent statement on this matter see "Toward a Coherent Set of National Policies for Higher Education," by Alan Pifer, The Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1968 (mimeographed).

[4] The term "political" is used here in a broad sense as "a persistent pattern of human relationships that involves, to a significant extent, power, rule, or authority." (Robert A. Dahl, *A Modern Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, p. 6). Thus every human organization has political aspects and may be viewed as a political system. There are, of course, other ways of viewing organizations if one wishes to focus on different aspects of their operations.

[5] For documentation of this point see the annual reports of presidents of private liberal arts colleges to faculties, students and constituents, the proceedings of associations of these institutions (for example, the Association of American Colleges) and especially the releases of offices engaged in fund raising in these colleges.

[6] For recent statements on this matter see The President's Review by McGeorge Bundy in The Ford Foundation *Annual Report 1967*.

[7] During interviews which were conducted with faculty at the six colleges under study, the dominant tone of the conversations was one of uncertainty about the future of the institutions. When pressed to describe their views of the future of their colleges the faculty respondents, without exception, were fearful that the trends in higher education were working against their institutions. Perhaps more important, they were unable to cite specific developments which they would propose to make the future more viable for their institutions.

[8] Edward C. Banfield, *Political Influence*, New York: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 235-262.

[9] Fred F. Harcleroad, "Influence of Organized Student Opinion on American College Curricula: An Historical Survey," doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1948.

[10] Thorstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America*, New York: Sagamore Press, 1957. (Originally published in 1918.)
[11] Laurance R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
[12] "Leaders . . . try to insure that whenever governmental means are used to deal with conflict, the decisions arrived at are widely accepted not solely from fear of punishment or coercion but also from a belief that it is morally right and proper to do so. Belief that the . . . acts of leaders . . . possess a quality of rightness and should be accepted . . . is what we mean by 'legitimacy'." Robert A. Dahl, *op. cit.* p. 19.
[13] For a more extensive discussion of the academic ideology see Logan Wilson, *The Academic Man*, New York: Octagon Books, 1964.
[14] See Fred F. Harcleroad, *op. cit.*, and Frances E. Falvey, *Student Participation in College Administration*, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.
[15] Joseph Katz, *The Student Activists*, New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 30, Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967 (mimeographed).
[16] Paul Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, *The Academic Mind*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.
[17] See any of several recent statements by student groups, especially those of the radical left. The charge that colleges are "tools of the establishment" is a favorite ploy which arouses student reaction.
[18] For a discussion of the new and more important role of higher education in America, see Daniel Bell, *The Reforming of General Education*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1966, especially Chapter 3, "The Tableau of Social Change," pp. 69-143.
[19] There are, of course, exceptions to this but the data collected from students in the colleges under study support this contention fully. Only a few private colleges are centers for liberal student activists.
[20] Again, there are exceptions but a large proportion of the graduates of private colleges go on to careers in medicine, law and teaching, all of which offer comfortable status in the society. It is interesting to note in this regard that the universities, public and private, are the centers of liberal student activity, furnish a disproportion of volunteers for such activities as the Peace Corps, etc., and that only a few private colleges are noted for such activities.
[21] See any of a series of studies, among them Philip E. Jacob, *Changing Values in College*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957 and Mervin Freedman's, *The College Experience*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.
[22] Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
[23] Nicholas J. Demerath, Richard W. Stephens and R. Robb Taylor, *Power, Presidents and Professors*, New York: Basic Books, 1967.
[24] Robert A. Dahl, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
[25] Edward C. Banfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-253.
[26] *College and University Presidents: Recommendations and Report of a Survey*, Albany: The New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership, 1967, p. 32.
[27] Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans-

lated by Henderson and Parsons, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947, p. 328.

[28] David Riesman, *Constraint and Variety in American Education*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday (Amchor), 1958.

[29] See Laurance R. Veysey, *op. cit.*, on the rise of the American university.

[30] There are, of course, exceptions to this general statement but they are rare. Study of minutes of faculty meetings in the colleges under investigation indicates that the picture is not overdrawn. In only one of the colleges is there evidence of faculty consideration of basic purposes and procedures on a continuing basis. It is not, one suspects, unrelated to the fact that this college has its programs under continual review and that it furnishes reports on the college to the faculty regularly. It also makes more use of consultants to the college than do the others.

[31] At Berkeley, students were reacting initially to restrictions on political and social action. Later they were complaining about the poor quality of some teaching, the fact that students were treated as "cogs" in a machine ("the knowledge factory") and the general neglect of undergraduate work. The restrictions on political and social action were modified to make the Berkeley regulations more consistent with those in effect in most U. S. universities.

[32] See Mitchell Cohen and Dennis Hale (eds.), *The New Student Left*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1967 (revised edition), a collection of writings, many by college students, for a representation of these positions.

[33] It is instructive to note that at Berkeley the student leaders were unable to continue the student protests into a second year.

[34] See Fred F. Harcleroad, *op. cit.*

[35] See Eliot Friedson (ed.), *Student Government, Student Leaders and the American College*, Philadelphia: United States National Student Association, 1955 and Joseph Katz, *op. cit.*

[36] Joseph Katz, *op. cit.*

[37] Drafted by representatives of several organizations including the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the United States National Student Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, and supported by several other groups.

[38] M. M. *Chambers, The College and the Courts Since 1950*, Danville, Illinois: Interstate, 1964.

[39] Manning M. Pattillo and Donald M. Mackenzie, *op. cit.*

[40] In part, this is due to the fact that examination or accreditation is conducted by faculty from colleges in the association who examine the college from traditional perspectives.

[41] In most private colleges endowment income constitutes less than 10 percent of the annual budget. Furthermore, while student charges have increased sharply during the past two decades and now constitute a major part of the annual income—60 to 80 percent in the typical private college—there is still income gap which must be filled with special gifts and grants.